

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Claims:

Claims 17-21 and 23-32 are in this application.

Claims 1-16 and 22 have been canceled.

Claims 17 and 27 are currently amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim 32 is new. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 17-20, 23-24, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marathe et al. (US 6,717,266) (hereinafter "Marathe"). (Office Action at Page 2).

Because Applicants established conception of the invention prior to the filing date of Marathe (June 18, 2002) and displayed due diligence from prior to the filing date of Marathe to the filing of the application, Marathe does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). The rejection of claims 17-20, 23-24, and 26 should be withdrawn.

An applicant can overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by showing conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to said date to the filing of the application. (C.F.R. § 1.131 and MPEP 715).

This application is a Divisional Application of and claims priority to Serial No.: 10/252,304 filed September 23, 2002, now Patent 6,642,158. (See Preliminary Amendment, July 9, 2003). Therefore, the effective filing date of this application is

September 23, 2002. Accompanying this response are the declarations of the inventors of this application, Gary A. Brist, Gary B. Long, and Daryl A. Sato ("the inventor declarations"), and attorneys William Ryann and John Travis, and Exhibits A, B, and C. The inventor declarations and Exhibit A establish conception of the invention prior to June 18, 2002 (the filing date of Marathe). (See Exhibit A at "Photo-Thermal Induced Diffusion"). Further, the inventor declarations and Exhibit B establish due diligence on the part of the inventors from conception to filing of the application.

In addition, the declarations of William Ryann and John Travis, along with Exhibits A, B, and C establish due diligence on the part of the responsible attorney from conception to application filing. The declaration of William Ryann and Exhibit A establish due diligence by William Ryann from conception to the last day of his employment with the responsible law firm (June 21, 2002 as established by Exhibit C). The declaration of John Travis and Exhibit B establish due diligence from June 21, 2002 to application filing on September 23, 2002.

Therefore, Applicants have established conception prior to June 18, 2002 coupled with due diligence from prior to June 18, 2002 to the effective filing date of September 23, 2002.

Claims 27-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by D'Amato (US 4,895,099). (Office Action at Page 3).

Independent claim 27 is currently amended. Amended claim 27 recites "the alloy formed by applying a laser beam to the first material disposed on the second material" and "wherein the first material includes a polymer epoxy." D'Amato fails to disclose a

trace with an alloy including a polymer epoxy. Instead, D'Amato discloses a bronze alloy including a silane coupling agent. (D'Amato at col. 2, lines 22-27). An epoxy is then bound to the silane coupling agent after the formation of the alloy. (D'Amato at col. 2, lines 30-34). The alloy of D'Amato does not include a polymer epoxy as is recited in the claim. Therefore, claim 27 is not anticipated by D'Amato.

Claims 28-31 depend from independent claim 27. Based at least in part on their dependencies, claims 28-31 are also not anticipated by D'Amato.

§ 103 Rejections

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marathe. (Office Action at Page 5).

As discussed, Marathe does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Therefore, the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marathe in view of D'Amato. (Office Action at Page 5).

Claim 25 depends from independent claim 17. As discussed, Marathe does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Therefore, the rejection of claim 25 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17-21 and 23-32 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393. A Fee Transmittal is enclosed in duplicate for fee processing purposes. The Examiner is invited to call Blayne Green at (503) 439-8778 if there remains any issue with allowance of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

INTEL CORPORATION

Dated: February 2, 2006



Blayne D. Green
Registration No. 56,198

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor, & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 765-8648